APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/478,313	01/06/2000	MICHAEL HUSAYN KALANTAR	YO999-417	1524

7590	12/12/2003

ANNE VACHON DOUGHERTY
3174 CEDAR ROAD
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY   10598

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, QUANG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/478,313	KALANTAR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Quang N. Nguyen	2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _27 October 2003_ .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _06 January 2000_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to the Amendment C filed on 10/27/2003.

Claims 1, 15 and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3.   **Claims 1-13 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being**

anticipated by Gabber et al. (US 5,961,593), herein after referred as Gabber.

4.   As to claim 1, Gabber teaches a method for providing common data from a first

source entity to a second entity, wherein said second entity is to perform processing on

the common data, comprising the steps of:

transferring the common data from the first source entity (users at user site 105a

send requests to access websites and user specific information such as user ID,

passwords, email addresses, telephone numbers, credit card numbers, postal address,

etc.) to be stored at the second entity (central proxy system 110a) for subsequent

processing on said common data by at least one of said plurality of different service applications (first, second and third executable routines are executed by central proxy system 110a) (Gabber, C6: L40-51, C7: L62-67, C8: L1-2 and L22-39);

storing the common data as stored data at said second entity (the proxy system maintains a conventional data structure to maintain the same, such as a database, data repository, an array, etc., or even an alias table, that maybe used to store and map user information to their substitute identifiers) (Gabber, C7: L25-38 and C10: L30-40);

associating a data handle to the stored data (one or more substitute identifiers to be constructed/generated from data specific to user 105a and a particular server site which user 105a intends to browse for the session), wherein said first and said second entity each are aware of the handle (Gabber, C7: L25-44 and C8: L22-39); and

invoking at least one service on said common data (the data received from user site 105a) by using said data handle (substitute identifiers) and invocation-specific data (e.g., the URL address of the NEW YORK TRIBUTE website "NYT") to invoke processing on that common data by at least one of said plurality of different service applications (processing one of first, second and third executable routines are executed by central proxy system 110a) (Gabber, C11: L37-53 and C12: L45-56).

5.   As to claim 2, Gabber teaches the method as in claim 1, further comprising storing the data handle with the stored data (Gabber, C7: L25-38 and C10: L30-40).

6.   As to claim 3, Gabber teaches the method as in claim 1, wherein said transferring and said invoking are done simultaneously and wherein said method further comprises invoking at least one successive service on said common data by using said data handle after said storing and associating steps (Gabber, 10: L22-40).

7.   As to claim 4, Gabber teaches the method as in claim 1, wherein the first entity invokes the at least one service (user's subsequent visit/request to access the NYT-site) by providing at least service invocation-specific data and said data handle to said second entity, i.e., the central proxy system (Gabber, C11: L37-53).

8.   As to claim 5, Gabber teaches the method as in claim 1, wherein said first entity invokes a plurality of services on said common data by transferring a composite service invocation to said second entity (i.e., user 105a sends requests to central proxy system 110a for specific data/information, services such as retrieving emails, online-purchases, stock quotes, etc).

9.   As to claims 6-8, Gabber teaches the method as in claim 1, wherein said associating of the handle is conducted at either first entity, second entity or third entity and wherein the handle is transferred to the other two entities (the substitute, or alias, identifiers are generated/constructed either at the user site, the local proxy system, the central proxy system, or at any other proxy site) (Gabber, C6: L17-37 and C13: L15-53).

10. As to claim 9, Gabber teaches the method as in claim 1, wherein said associating of a handle is performed implicitly by the transfer of said common data (Gabber, C8: L22-39).

11. As to claims 10-12, Gabber teaches the method as in claims 1 and 3, further comprising transforming said common data from a first representation to a second representation (i.e., encryption of said common data) and transferring across a network (the central proxy system 110a transforms user 105a specific information such as user ID, passwords, email addresses, telephone numbers, credit card numbers, etc. to substitute, or alias, identifiers and transmits/retransmits across a network to a particular server site 110g) (Gabber, C11: L7-58, C12: L45-67 and C13: L1-14).

12. As to claim 13, Gabber teaches the method as in claim 4, wherein said at least one service comprises file I/O by the second entity (the central proxy system 110a transmits/retransmits user 105a data/service requests to the web servers 110g, receives and forwards the requested data/service to the user 105a after removing or substituting portions of the browsing commands that would identify the user sites to the server sites) (Gabber, C14: L66-67 and C15: L1-7).

13. Claim 15 is a corresponding system claim of method claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

14.   Claim 16 is a corresponding system claim of method claim 5; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

15.   As to claim 17, Gabber teaches the system of claim 15, wherein said at least one data handle component comprises a component of said first entity (e.g., user site 105a IP address, user ID, passwords, email addresses, telephone numbers, credit card numbers, etc.) (Gabber, C8: L17-39).

16.   As to claim 18, Gabber teaches the system of claim 15, wherein said at least one data handle component comprises a component of second entity (e.g., central proxy system IP address, credit card number, etc.)

17.   As to claim 19, Gabber teaches the system of claim 15, wherein said first entity is located in a separate protection domain from said second entity (Gabber, C8: L5-12).

18.   Claim 20 is a corresponding program storage device claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

20.   Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Gabber, in view of Draves (US 5,802,590).

21.   As to claim 14, Gabber teaches a method as in claim 4, wherein the service is

provided by the second entity (the first routine of the central proxy system applies

pseudo-random and hash functions to the data received from user site 105a to generate

substitute identifiers, Gabber, C10: L6-22) but does not explicitly teach that the second

entity comprises a kernel.

In the related art, Draves teaches a system and method for allowing processes to

access resources wherein a kernel of an operating system maintains a system-wide

resource table containing resource entries (Draves, Figs. 2-3 and corresponding text,

C3: L42-67, C4: L1-14, L48-67, C5 and C6: L1-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to

modify and combine the teachings of Gabber and Draves to include a kernel in the

second entity because it would allow the system to use the kernel to hash the key to generate the handle associating to the stored resources.

22.   Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this office action.

23.   Applicant's arguments as well as request for reconsideration filed on 10/27/2003 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

24.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

25.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703)

305-8190.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the

organization is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-

3800/4700.

Quang N. Nguyen

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER